

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

This Amendment is in response to the Office Action mailed September 7, 2007.

Claims 1-21 were pending and examined. Claims 1, 6, 7, and 21 have been amended, claims 2-5 and 8-18 have been canceled without prejudice, and new claim 22 has been added. Accordingly, claims 1, 6, 7, and 19-22 remain pending in this application after entry of this Amendment. Reconsideration of the rejected claims is respectfully requested.

Objection to Claim 21

Claim 21 is objected to because of an informality and has been amended accordingly. Thus, the objection to claim 21 is believed to be overcome.

35 U.S.C. §102(e) Rejection of Claims 1, 2, and 8-21

Claims 1, 2, and 8-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Decasper et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2007/0192474, hereinafter "Decasper"). Applicants respectfully submit that Decasper does not disclose each and every feature of these claims.

Embodiments of the present invention are directed to techniques for sharing information among a plurality of peer client systems in a peer-to-peer (P2P) network. (Specification: para. 7). According to one set of embodiments, information is stored in one or more of the peer client systems. These pieces of information are referred to as information sources. The information sources are made available to the various peer client systems on the P2P network. (Specification: para. 12).

In one set of embodiments, one or more first peer client systems may subscribe to a particular information source stored on a second peer client system. (Specification: Fig. 8, reference numeral 701). Thus, a "subscription" in the context of the present invention refers to an association between one or more peer client systems and an information source stored on another peer client system. If the information source is subsequently modified (for example, the data in the information source may be updated), this modification is detected and the second peer client system receives a list of all peer client systems (e.g., the one or more first peer client

systems) subscribed to the information source. (Specification: para. 41). The second peer client system then transmits an alert message to the one or more first peer client systems indicating that the information source has been modified. (Specification: para. 42).

In accordance with the above, Applicants' claim 1 (as amended) recites:

A method for accessing information in a peer to peer network, the method comprising:

storing information among a plurality of peer client systems, wherein the information can be accessed by the peer client systems, the information collectively referred to as information sources;

storing, in a first server system, location information indicative of a location of each information source, wherein the peer client systems are configured to communicate with the first server system to access the location information;

generating, in the first server system, one or more subscriptions, each subscription being associated with an information source and with one or more peer client systems, wherein the peer client systems are configured to communicate with the first server system to subscribe to one or more information sources;

detecting, in the first server system, a modification to an information source, the step of detecting comprising receiving, from a first peer client system, an indication that a first information source has been modified, and if the first server system determines that there is a first subscription that is associated with the first information source, communicating to the first peer client system a list of second peer client systems that are associated with the first subscription, wherein the first peer client communicates an alert message to each second peer client system.

wherein each second peer client system can access an information source that is associated with the alert message, a copy of the information source being stored in another peer client system, and

wherein each second peer client system can access the copy from the other peer client system.

(Applicants' claim 1, as amended, emphasis added).

At least the above features are not disclosed by Decasper.

Decasper is directed to a system for caching data transferred between content servers and clients in a network environment. (Decasper: para. 2). As shown in Fig. 1 of Decasper, this system includes a plurality of content servers 202, a "master controller" 201, and a

plurality of clients 203. Master controller 201 is configured to maintain “user profiles” for clients 203. Each user profile contains information about the content an associated client is interested in. (Decasper: para. 27). Master controller 201 is also configured to discover when new content is available on content servers 202. This may be achieved by subscribing to content servers 202 and thereby receiving periodic updates, or “by directly crawling (240) the content available on content server 202.” (Decasper: paras. 41, 43). If master controller 201 determines that new content is available on content servers 202 that matches any of the user profiles, that new content is downloaded and cached on the master controller. If a client 203 subsequently requests the cached content from content servers 202, master controller 201 intercepts the request and directs the client to download the content from the cache. (Decasper: para. 47).

Applicants submit that the invention of Decasper as described above is substantially different from the claimed embodiments of Applicants’ claim 1. For example, Decasper does not disclose anything about “storing information among a plurality of peer client systems” (referred to as information sources) and “detecting. . . a modification to an information source. . . the step of detecting comprising. . . communicating to the first peer client system a list of second peer client systems that are associated with the first subscription” as recited in amended claim 1.

As indicated above, Decasper is directed to a system for caching data transferred between content servers and clients. Thus, the “information sources,” or content providers, of Decasper are dedicated content servers such as content servers 202 of Fig. 2. Decasper fails to teach storing information on a peer client system as an information source.

Even *assuming arguendo* that the clients (*e.g.*, clients 203 of Fig. 2) described in Decasper may be construed as information sources, Decasper still fails to teach detecting a modification to an information source, and communicating to a first peer client system a list of second peer client systems that are subscribed to the modified information source as recited in amended claim 1. In the Office Action, the Examiner asserts that this feature is shown at paragraph 27 of Decasper. (Office Action: pg. 7). Applicants respectfully disagree.

As best understood, the cited section describes the process of determining, at master controller 201, the set of clients 203 that are interested in a copy of new content that is

available on content servers 202: “as new content becomes available, the controller searches the database of client profiles to determine the set of clients which will want a copy of the new content.” (Decasper: para. 27). Master controller 201 then instructs the identified set of clients to download the content from a specific location (such as the controller’s cache). Thus, at best, the cited section merely teaches identifying a list of client systems at a central controller. The cited section makes no reference to the concept of communicating to a first peer client system a list of second client systems, let alone a list of second client systems that are subscribed to an information source. Thus, Decasper fails to disclose or even suggest “detecting. . . a modification to an information source. . . the step of detecting comprising. . . communicating to the first peer client system a list of second peer client systems that are associated with the first subscription” as recited in amended claim 1.

Applicants submit that Decasper also does not disclose “wherein the first peer client communicates an alert message to each second peer client system” as recited in amended claim 1. In the Office Action, the Examiner asserts that this feature is shown in Decasper at paragraphs 61-62 because “the master controller keeps track of where the content is located, since master controller can give alerts to new content (see paragraph 72), the master controller can allow a peer to download content from another peer.” (Office Action: 7). Applicants respectfully disagree.

Even *assuming arguendo* the “the master controller can give alerts to new content” as asserted by the Examiner, this merely teaches that the master controller of Decasper can communicate alert messages to client systems. This does not teach anything about the communication of an alert message between a first peer client system and a second peer client system. As best understood, Decasper is completely silent on this specific concept. Thus, Decasper fails to disclose or even suggest “wherein the first peer client communicates an alert message to each second peer client system” as recited in amended claim 1.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicant submits that Decasper does not anticipate or render obvious Applicants’ claim 1. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the rejection of claim 1 be withdrawn.

Independent claim 19 recites features that are substantially similar to independent claim 1, and is thus believed to be allowable for at least a similar rationale as discussed for claim 1, and others.

Dependent claims 2 and 8-18 have been canceled without prejudice. Thus, the rejection of these claims is moot.

Dependent claims 20 and 21 depend from independent claim 19, and are thus believed to be allowable for at least a similar rationale as discussed for claim 19, and others.

35 U.S.C. §103(a) Rejection of Claims 3-7

Claims 3-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Decasper. Applicants respectfully submit that Decasper does not teach or suggest the features of these claims.

Claims 3-5 have been canceled without prejudice. Thus, the rejection of these claims is moot.

Claims 6 and 7 depend from independent claim 1, which is not rendered obvious by Decasper as discussed above. Further, Applicants submit that claims 6 and 7 recite additional features that are not taught or suggested by Decasper. For at least these reasons, Applicants submit that claims 6 and 7 are not rendered obvious by Decasper, and respectfully request that the rejection of these claims be withdrawn.

Newly Presented Claim 22

Claim 22 has been added to cover different aspects of the present invention. This claim is supported by the Specification as filed does not add new matter. The features recited in claim 22 are believed to be allowable over the cited art for at least a similar rationale as discussed for independent claim 1, and others. Applicants therefore respectfully requests consideration and allowance of newly presented claim 22.

Amendments to the Claims

Unless otherwise specified, amendments to the claims are made for purposes of clarity, and are not intended to alter the scope of the claims or limit any equivalents thereof. The amendments are supported by the Specification as filed and do not add new matter.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance. The issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance at an early date is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 650-326-2400.

Respectfully submitted,

/Andrew J. Lee/

Andrew J. Lee
Reg. No. 60,371

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-3834
Tel: 650-326-2400
Fax: 415-576-0300
AJL:mg
61198877 v1